#### REMARKS

Claims 15-20 are pending and remain at issue.

The Abstract have been amended as requested by the Examiner.

No new matter has been added by this Amendment.

## Objection to the Abstract

The Examiner objected to the abstract because "it is not in the form of a single paragraph." The abstract has been amended to be in the form of a single paragraph; therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the abstract.

## Rejection of Claims 15 and 18 Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected Claims 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. \$103 (a) "as being unpatentable over Heffernan et al. (USPN 5,379,419)." Applicant respectfully submits, that the rejection of Claims 15 and 18 are unfounded. Heffernan et al. was filed Dec. 7, 1990. The present application is a divisional of application serial no. 08/083,361, filed June 28, 1993, which is a continuation of serial no. 07/526,424, filed May 21, 1990. Accordingly, the present application has a priority date of at least May 21, 1990. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Heffernan et al. is not proper prior art with respect to the present application. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Since the Examiner, has not provided a valid grounds for rejecting Claims 15 and 18, Applicant respectfully request allowance of Claims 15 and 18.

# Objection of Claims 16-17 and 19-20

The Examiner objected to Claims 16-17 and 19-20 for "being dependent upon a rejected base claim." Applicant respectfully

LAW OFFICES OF SEJERVEN, MORRILL, MacPHERSON, FRANKLIN & FRIEL LLP

25 METRO DRIVE SUITE 700 SAN JOSE, CA 95110 (408) 453-9200 FAX (408) 453-7979

L:\DMS\5491\M-1226-2\0205443.WP

- 2 -

SER. NO. 08/439,207

requests the withdrawal of the objection to Claims 16 and 17, which are dependent upon Claim 15, due to the patentability of Claim 15 as explained above. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objection to Claims 19 and 20, which are dependent upon Claim 18, due to the patentability of Claim 18 as explained above.

### References Made of Record but not Relied Upon

Applicant respectfully submits that the other references cited on by the Examiner in the PTO Form 892 accompanying the Office Action of November 29, 1996, are also not proper prior art references. Specifically, Kroenke et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,548,749) was filed Oct 29, 1993; Schiefer et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,542,073) was filed Aug 1, 1995 but was a divisional of U.S. Pat. No. 5,469,568 filed Jan. 7, 1993; Alashqur (U.S. Pat. No. 5,504,885) was filed Jun. 29, 1993; and as mentioned above Heffernan et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,379,419) was filed Dec. 7, 1990. Thus none of the references cited by the Examiner predate the present application, which has a priority date of at least May 21, 1990. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the references cited by the Examiner are not proper prior art with respect to the present application.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant believe that the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully request a notice of allowance to be issued for this application. If the Examiner has any questions

relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant at 408-453-9200.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward C. Kwok

Attorney for Applicant Reg. No. 33,938

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on first states Tolland St United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C., 20231, on January 28, 1997.

1/28/97

Date of Signature

Attorney for Applicant